

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/125814

Applicant(s)

DOHI et al.

Examiner

Alycia Berman

Art Unit

1617

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alycia Berman

(3) Keiko Takagi

(2) Russell Travers

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 11/6/02

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ Applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 5 of record

Identification of prior art discussed: Suzuki

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Product-by-process claims along with evidence showing criticality in method steps would advance prosecution.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Alycia Berman  
Examiner's signature, if required